

## EPA Questions for Public Meeting May 29, 2014

Questions from April 21, 2014 meeting and submissions in the interim period:

1. List of documents to be reviewed by US Army Corp of Engineers-KC –
  - a. Will that include Latty Ave documents about the radioactive materials taken from there and dumped in this landfill?
  - b. Historical documents – Harvey Ferdman – 1974 document saying topsoil was scraped, 39 tons mixed with barium sulfate. Will CORP have the latitude to look at where the materials come from?

USACE Response: The scope of the second Interagency Agreement is still being developed; however, the scope will include review of information necessary for USACE to perform an Independent Technical Review of documents being developed by the Responsible Parties in response to the National Remedy Review Board Comments. It has not yet been determined what specific background documents will be reviewed. Please provide specific document titles/dates and what your specific concern is with respect to these documents.

2. The Corp is putting together a team to type and identify; who is working on the project, technical assistance (review documents), design reviews (work plans – plans for isolation barrier & procedure for construction & activity – air monitoring plan, bird hazard mitigation plan, waste handling & storing procedures, waste disposal procedures – are they complete, technically correct, and compliant with regulations, are they protective of the community and the environment

USACE Response: Please clarify question.

Anticipated question: What disciplines are reviewing the documents?

Answer: The Isolation Barrier Work Plan and Design review team includes two geotechnical engineers, one experienced in subsurface barrier-structures and one experienced with subsurface barriers installed in landfills and with RIM investigations/remediation), one Health Physicist (experienced in a wide array of FUSRAP and non-FUSRAP projects dealing with health and safety involving RIM), and one Biologist (experienced in bird hazard identification and mitigation).

One Construction Engineer (experienced in Civil works construction projects and RIM remediation) will review the final drafts to understand the construction requirements..

3. Doug Clemens asked: If CORP opinion stands juxtaposed to the EPA, what is the resolution to this process? a. Who specifically will make the decision?

USACE Response: On a complex site, such as the West Lake Landfill site, there are a number of technical disciplines across multiple agencies that form the team that reviews the submitted documents. Each discipline/agency reviews the documents and provides comments based upon their technical discipline, experience, and perspective.

Comments from all supporting agencies are provided to the EPA, who consolidates the comments, ensures there are no duplicated comments, and that the comments are clearly stated. If comment clarification is required, the EPA will return the comment to the reviewer and ask that they provide clarification. Once comment consolidation is complete, the EPA forwards the comments to the Responsible Party (RP) for review, evaluation, and response. The RP will provide their responses to EPA, who will forward the responses to all the commenters. If required, a design review meeting is conducted where all commenters, the RP, their contractor, and the EPA will meet to collectively discuss each comment and response and discuss varying points of view. The result of these meetings may include 1) all parties coming to a consensus on how each comment is to be resolved, 2) a requirement to have the RP and their contractor perform additional research before a decision is made on a comment, or 3) there is no consensus on how the comment is to be resolved. In the case where there is no consensus, additional research, discussions, and consultation with other technical experts may be employed to obtain the information necessary to resolve the comments. On those limited occasions where resolution is not achieved, the EPA, as the lead agency, has the final decision on how all comments will be resolved.

-----Questions below require EPA response-----

4. What contingency plan will be for the homeowners and workers when construction begins opening up the trench? (The public wants to see a written plan)

5. In the agreed order between the EPA and Republic, there are agreed transfers of information. When DNR was entered into negotiations with Republic Services last summer regarding the contingency plan regarding what would happen where and when, DNR was able within days of receiving a work plan, to post that on the DNR website in order to give an opportunity to review and submit comments to DNR. Responses were included in responses to the work site. The draft work plan between EPA and Republic Services has yet to be published on the EPA's website. Will the EPA put these documents on the website to allow people in this community to submit comments on the records before final decisions are made? (This is an issue raised frequently without answers (see:Ed Smith questions to Jeffrey Fields).)

6. At last community meeting, there was a request for 24/7 monitoring. Will the EPA provide monitoring in addition to the DNR?

7. We never got lab results on the path for the barrier. Core seed sampling was done. Not received all or in summary format to determine if there is a clean line yet to use for barrier. Was a clear path found?

8. We would like to see written information from STL Corp, radium 226 and Thor 230, can be only recognized with air monitoring filtrations systems. Where and when can the community see the data for the 2-3 hours turn around monitoring?

9. What happened at the remedy review board?

10. Will the EPA review the site data available and conduct any additional measurements needed to assess the conditions of OU1 regarding the potential for the occurrence of a spontaneous SSE at OU1 and to report the findings to the CAG. (Specifically the EPA not EMSI)

3. Will the EPA make and post contingency plans for controlling and putting out any surface fire on OU1 with minimal risk to firefighters and for communicating with and evacuating nearby businesses and residents, if needed?

a. Will an explanation of the contingency plan to be given to the CAG so that you can help make people aware of the plan in the event that a fire ever occurs on OU1 before the impacted surface soil is cleaned up?

11. What contingency plan will be for the homeowners and workers when construction begins opening up the trench?

12. What is the MDA (Minimal Detectable Activity) of the instrumentation used by the EPA to survey BMAC? Is it low enough to be capable of detection the remediation level (6 picocuries per gram) of alphas?

13. The proper response to the elevated transuranic levels in the soil is to perform detailed and systematic soil sampling. Why is a different method being used at BMAC?